

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/032,535

Applicant(s)

SHAW ET AL.

Examiner

OJO O. OYEBISI

Art Unit

3696

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) OJO O. OYEBISI.(3) Ella Colbert.(2) JOHN ALEXANDER GALBREATH.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 12 February 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 52.

Identification of prior art discussed: SEC reference and Gutterman.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant's representative has further described the claimed invention and pointed out key features that distinguish the claimed invention from the prior arts. The applicant's argument would be considered upon filing a formal response to the last office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

## Agreements

- The Limitrader system does not have the message-sending component of the invention.
  - The Limitrader system does not meet the data security component of the invention; "when 'restricting access' is changed to 'preventing knowledge' in the claims
- 

- The individualized features in Limitrader would be cut off if an integrated OMS was grafted onto it.
- Regarding phone<sup>lines</sup>, it is possible to ~~make~~ make an OMS function over regular phone lines, but it would be sub-optimal + slow.